

&4.UP 10 2; Draft, smtst; -n -PA4 -dFX-NORMAL -y -e; dumbp  
L.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....R  
ITEM NO. 103 COURT NO. 7 SECTION XV

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 150/1999

M/s L.R. Ferro Alloys Ltd. .. Appellant (s)

Vs.

Mahavir Mahto & Anr. .. Respondent(s)

( With appln. for exemption from filing OT and permission to  
place addl. documents on record )

DATE : 21.11.2000 : This/These matter (s) was/were  
called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S. RAJENDRA BABU  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.N. VARIAVA

For Appellant (s) : Mr. Rudreshwar Singh, Adv.  
M/s Tapes Singh, Shishir Pinki,  
R.P. Wadhvani, Adv.

For Respondent (s) : Mr. Sanjay Paul, Adv.  
Mr. M.J. Paul, Adv.

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

.....L.....I.....J  
.SP2

The appeal is allowed in part in terms of the signed  
order.

.SP1 Charanjit [ S. Malkani ]  
Court Master

[ Signed order is placed on the file ]

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA  
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 150/1999@@  
CCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCC

M/s L.R. Ferro Alloys Ltd. .. Appellant

Vs.

Mahavir Mahto & Anr. .. Respondents

O\_R\_D\_E\_R@@  
AAAAAAAAA

.....L.....I.....J  
.SP2

On 23.3.1995 an accident took place in the factory of the Appellant at about 3 P.M. while Respondent No. 1 (hereinafter referred to as the Respondent) was pouring water for cooling the hot slab when the slab burst causing burn injuries on his face resulting in loss of sight in both eyes.

A claim was made by the Respondent before the Commissioner under the Workmen's Compensation Act. The Commissioner determined the amount payable by way of compensation to the Respondent. In addition he also quantified the penalty and interest payable for the delayed payment made by the appellant. The matter was carried in appeal to the High Court. There was no dispute regarding quantum of compensation payable, and all that was to be considered was whether the appellant is liable to pay the penalty and interest.

On that aspect of the matter the learned Single Judge noticed that the compensation due under the statute had not been paid within one month from the date of accident and

- 2 -

therefore appellant was liable to pay penalty and interest from the date the amount became due and payable which meant the date of accident or at the latest one month thereafter. Therefore, the liability of the appellant being evident in those circumstances, the learned Single Judge declined to interfere with the order under appeal. The matter was carried in appeal further to the Division Bench and that appeal was dismissed holding that it was not maintainable in view of the decision in Smt. Chhaya Rani Vs. Smt. Dhan Devi- 1997 (2) All PLR, 147.

Considering the facts and circumstances of this case we do not think the question raised before us as to whether any appeal lay on the Letter Patent side, need not be examined in this case.

The only contention put forth before us is that the entire liability including penalty and interest will have to be reimbursed by the Insurance company and this aspect has not been examined by the learned Single Judge in the High Court and needs examination at our hands. In Ved Prakash Garg Vs.@@

CCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCC

Premi Devi and Ors. - 1997 (8) SCC 1 this Court after@@  
CCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCC  
examining the entire scheme of the Act held that payment of  
interest and penalty are two distinct liabilities arising  
under the Act, while liability to pay interest is part and  
parcel of legal liability to pay compensation upon default of  
payment of that amount within one month. Therefore, claim

- 3 -

for compensation along with interest will have to be made good  
jointly by the Insurance Company with the insured employer.  
But, so far as the penalty imposed on the insured employer is  
on account of his personal fault Insurance Company cannot be  
made liable to reimburse penalty imposed on the employer.  
Hence the compensation with interest is payable by the  
Insurance Company but not penalty. Following the said  
decision and for the reasons stated therein we modify the  
order made by the High Court to that extent. The appeal is  
allowed in part accordingly.

.SP1

.....J@@  
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA  
[ S. RAJENDRA BABU ]@@  
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

.....J@@  
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA  
[ S.N. VARIAVA ] @@  
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

New Delhi,@@  
AAAAAAAAAAAA  
November 21, 2000@@  
AAAAAAAAAAAA